



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,914	12/16/2005	Dieter Adolf Kluger	1823.001	2474
23598 7590 03/26/2008 BOYLE FREDRICKSON S.C. 840 North Plankinton Avenue MILWAUKEE, WI 53203				
EXAMINER STEPHENSON, DANIEL P				
ART UNIT 3676		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/26/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@boylefred.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/560,914

Applicant(s)

KLUGER ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL P. STEPHENSON

Art Unit

3676

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/003)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the pre-grant publication to Bode (US 2003/0021922). Bode '922 (Fig. 2-4) discloses a well screen that includes; a base pipe; an inner cylindrical stand-off made of a skeletal mesh; a filter layer around the inner stand-off; an outer cylindrical stand-off around the filter layer; and a cover around the outer stand-off. The stand-offs provide a cage around the filter layer, have a greater rigidity and are arranged to provide structural resistance to collapse of the cover towards the filter. The longitudinal edges of the mesh stand-off are connected together. The outer cover is capable of collapsing, even though it may resist it, if well pressure is high enough. In addition, it is noted by the examiner, that if a layer is located below another layer, then it will inherently resist collapse of the layer above it. The stand-off layer is a mesh of orthogonally disposed rods, which are welded together at their ends. The outer layer is a tube created from a perforated metal sheet (para. 33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 9, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the pre-grant publication to Echols et al. (US2002/0178582). Echols et al. (Fig.2 and 7) discloses a well screen that includes; a base pipe; an inner cylindrical stand-off (52) made of a skeletal mesh; a filter layer (50) around the inner stand-off; an outer cylindrical stand-off (48) around the filter layer; and a cover around the outer stand-off. The stand-offs provide a cage around the filter layer and are arranged to resist collapse of the cover towards the filter. The longitudinal edges of the mesh stand-off are connected together. The outer cover is capable of collapsing, even through it may resist it, if well pressure is high enough. In addition, it is noted by the examiner, that if a layer is located below another layer, then it will inherently resist collapse of the layer above it. Echols et al. does not explicitly disclose that the stand-off layer is more rigid than the filter layer. It is common in the well screen art to use a thicker wire with a coarse screen over a fine screen. Inherently, the thicker wire/stand-off layer will be more rigid than the thinner wire used in the fine screen/filter layer. The outer cover is made from a perforated metal sheet.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bode '922. Bode '922 shows all the limitations of the claimed invention, except, it does not disclose that the distance between the filter layer and the outer cover is 2.5-3mm. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a stand-off of this thickness, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimal or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/12/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
7. It is the assertion of the applicant that Bode '922 does not disclose a collapsible outer cover, stand-offs that are more rigid than the filter layer or that the stand-off layer is designed to resist the collapse of the outer layer. The examiner respectfully traverses these assertions. As stated above, the outer cover of Bode '922 is capable of collapse, therefore it is collapsible. The stand-off layer of Bode '922 is a 10x10 while the filter layer is a 24x10. The 10x10 has a thicker wire and will inherently have more rigidity than the filter layer. Also, as stated previously, any layer which is located underneath of another layer will inherently resist collapse of the first layer.
8. It is the assertion of the applicant that the Echols et al. has roughly the same deficiencies as the Bode '922 reference. The examiner traverses these assertions using the same rationale as applied in the previous paragraph.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL P. STEPHENSON whose telephone number is (571)272-7035. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer Gay can be reached on (571) 272-7029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jennifer H Gay/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
3676

DPS